

## **Evaluation of the 2002 Canadian Psychological Association Convention**

*Jennifer A. Veitch  
National Research  
Council of Canada*

*Abraham S. Ross  
Memorial University of  
Newfoundland*

*Kate E. Charles  
National Research  
Council of Canada*

*Barbara M. Wells  
York University*

This is the second year of systematic evaluation of the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) Convention, undertaken by a sub-committee of the Convention Committee. The purpose of this evaluation is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the convention and its operation, in order to establish an empirical foundation for decision-making in future convention planning. As always, the goal is to make the CPA convention an exciting, interesting, educational and social experience for members and non-members alike.

### Method

#### *Questionnaire*

The questionnaire was a modified version of the closed-ended questionnaire used in 2001 (see Appendix A). It was modified to take into account new issues and in response to the suggestions made in the 2001 evaluation report (Ross, Gallivan, Schepmyer, & Veitch, 2001). Only the closed-ended form was used in 2002 because the open-ended data from 2001 had proved costly to manage and difficult to interpret, making it a poor investment of limited committee resources. All questionnaires were in English. Translation was beyond the means of the subcommittee, and in any case the British Columbia location did not seem likely to draw very many attendees without English fluency.

#### *Procedure*

It proved to be difficult to recruit students to collect data in 2002; therefore, three non-student CPA members also distributed questionnaires. The one student who did assist received free convention registration. Two members of the team had other responsibilities during the convention, which prevented them from contributing greatly to the data collection. As a result of these problems, the sample size is small.

Data collection was restricted to Friday and Saturday of the convention, in keeping with the previous year's suggestion (Ross et al., 2001). The team distributed questionnaires using a simple random sampling procedure: every  $n^{\text{th}}$  person (usually the 5<sup>th</sup>) was selected as they passed a fixed location. CPA Board members, Convention Committee members, and CPA staff were excluded from participation.

The senior authors met with the team to explain the importance of random sampling and how the random sample would be selected.

At the opening ceremonies on the Thursday of the convention, an announcement was made about the evaluation. Attendees were urged to take the time to respond to the questionnaire if they were selected as part of the sample.

If an attendee asked the person distributing the questionnaires for a questionnaire to fill out (i.e., a person who was not part of the random sample) the data were flagged. Responses from the 11 people who volunteered are not included in the results of the random sample.

## Results

### *Response Rate*

Fifty-one randomly selected persons responded to the questionnaires. Of the people randomly selected, ten people were not willing to respond, all of them because they were on their way to other activities.

The number of respondents for each day and their registration can be seen in Table 1.

*Table 1: Period of registration and number surveyed*

	<i>Registrants</i>	<i>Respondents' Registration</i>	<i>Surveys by Date</i>
Thursday only	18		
Friday only	24		29
Saturday only	17		20
Whole Convention	885	51	
Not indicated			2
Total	944	51	51

### *Sample Comparison to Population*

To assess sample bias there are two questions for which we can compare the sample to the population; (a) whether they were students and (b) whether people registered for the whole convention or for a single day.

Registration statistics indicate that of the 944<sup>1</sup> registrants, 43.6% registered as students (lower than the 56% students in 2001). Of the 51 respondents who responded to the question, only 17% indicated they considered themselves primarily students. A chi-square test of goodness-of-fit using the convention registrations for expected values indicates that the sample distribution differs significantly from the convention distribution ( $\chi^2 = 14.05, df=1, p<.05$ ) with students being under-represented in the sample.

Only 6.3% of the people who attended the convention registered for one day (a slightly lower percentage than in 2001), and of these 59 people, 41 were registered for Friday or Saturday, when data were collected. All of the randomly-selected participants indicated that they had registered for the entire convention.

*Demographics of respondents.* As can be seen in Table 2, most respondents were from Ontario or Alberta, whereas most attendees were from British Columbia or Ontario. Although the distribution does not follow precisely the distribution of convention attendees, a chi-square test of goodness of fit using the registrants' addresses for expected values indicates that the deviation is not statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 13.7, df=12, n.s.$ ).

<sup>1</sup> We did not include Companions or the Exhibitors in this total.

*Table 2: Geographic distribution*

	<i>Respondents' Province of Work</i>		<i>Attendees' Mailing Addresses</i>	
	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
BC	9	17.6	354	37.5
Alberta	11	21.6	115	12.2
Saskatchewan	3	5.9	37	3.9
Manitoba	2	3.9	47	5.0
Ontario	14	27.5	249	26.4
Quebec	5	9.8	56	5.9
New Brunswick			14	1.5
Nova Scotia	2	3.9	32	3.4
PEI			5	0.5
Newfoundland			4	0.4
Territories			1	0.1
USA	2	3.9	21	2.2
Other	1	2.0	9	1.0
Not indicated	2	3.9		
Total	51	100	944	100

Most respondents reported belonging to more than one organization. Table 3 shows the frequency of response for each organization together with the percentage of the sample it represents. The total sums to more than 100% because of multiple memberships.

*Table 3: Membership in psychological organizations*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent of Sample</i>
CPA	37	72.6
CRHSPP	1	2.0
Provincial Colleges	8	17.6
Provincial Associations	12	23.5
Specialty Associations	10	19.6
APA/APS	13	25.5

*Note.* Specialty Associations are psychological associations in specific subdisciplines (e.g., Psychonomic Society; Society for Research in Child Development), of which 8 were named, only two of them by more than one person).

Thirty-two respondents reported membership in one or more CPA Section, some in as many as five sections. The CPA section(s) to which respondents belong can be seen in Table 4.

*Table 4: Number of respondents from each section*

<i>Section</i>	<i>Respondents (N)</i>	<i>Registrants' Primary Section (N)</i>
Adult Development and Aging	0	3
Brain and Behaviour	1	0
Clinical	7	82
Clinical Neuropsychology	0	4
Community	0	1
Counselling	4	19
Criminal Justice	1	28
Developmental	3	17
Psychologists in Education	0	1
Environmental	1	8
Family	0	2
Health	4	14
History and Philosophy	3	11
Industrial/Organizational	3	38
International and Cross-Cultural	1	7
Military	4	0
Perception, Learning and Cognition	0	1
Psychopharmacology	0	0
Psychologists in Education	0	14
Religion	0	0
Sexual Orientation & Gender Identity	1	0
Social and Personality	6	22
Students	4	17
Teaching	3	4
Women and Psychology (SWAP)	4	12
Interest Group - Disaster and Trauma	0	0
Interest Group - Psychophysiology	0	0
None identified/not applicable	20	639

*Note.* Respondents may belong to more than one section.

Respondents were asked whether they classified themselves primarily as a practitioner in the publicly funded sector, a practitioner in the private sector, a student, a scientist or an educator. This question was rephrased following the 2001 evaluation, and the result was more interpretable (Table 5).

*Table 5: Primary identity as a psychologist*

<i>Primary Identity</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Practitioner/public sector	7.	13.7
Practitioner-scientist/public sector	12.	23.5
Scientist/public sector	8.	15.7
Educator/public sector	8.	15.7
Student/public sector	9.	17.6
Other/public sector	1.	2.0
Practitioner/private sector	4.	7.8
Practitioner-scientist/private sector	1.	2.0
Scientist/private sector	0	0
Did not respond	1.	2.0

*Reasons for Attending*

Respondents were asked to rank-order the importance to them of eight reasons for attending the CPA convention. Some respondents complained that this task was difficult, but most provided answers to each item. As may be seen in Table 6, the reason most frequently identified as #1 was “Learning about advances in my specific area of interest”, which shared the highest median response with “Giving presentations/publication credit”. Continuing education and networking came next in importance, followed by learning about advances in other areas of psychology and learning about/having input in advocacy. Touristic opportunities and association meetings were tied for last place in importance.

*Table 6: Reasons for attending CPA*

	<i>N</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Mode</i>
Learning about advances in my specific field of interest	45	2	1
Giving presentations/publication credit	43	2	2
Learning about advances in other areas of psychology	45	4	5
Learn about and have input into advocacy on behalf of science, education and practice	41	5	6
Continuing education / building practical skills	43	4	3
Networking opportunities	44	4	4
Tourist opportunities	42	7	8
Association meetings	41	7	8

*Overall Reactions to Convention*

As can be seen in Table 7, the majority (64.7%) of the respondents rated the convention as “good” or “excellent.” Although year-by-year comparisons are risky with this year’s small data set, it is consistent with the 2001 result (58% “good” or “excellent”).

*Table 7: Overall rating of convention*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Awful	0	
Bad	1	2
Okay	16	31.4
Good	27	52.9
Excellent	6	11.8
Missing	1	2
Total	51	

Respondents were asked if they had attended previous conventions and, if they had, how the present convention compared. (See Table 8). Thirty-five respondents (69%) had attended previous conventions. Of these 18 people (51%) said that it was the same. However, seven respondents (20%) said that it was worse than previous conventions. Ten respondents (28%) thought that it was better than previous conventions.

*Table 8: If you have been to previous conventions how would you rate the present one?*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Much worse		
Worse	6	17.1
*	1	2.9
Same	18	51.4
Better	8	22.9
Much better	2	
Total	35	

*Note.* A row with no label but \* indicates a response between the two categories.

When asked to compare value to overall cost of the convention, 41% thought the price about right and 39% thought that it was good or very good value for the cost (Table 9).

*Table 9: Value for overall cost*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Very poor value for the cost	0	0
Poor value for the cost	9	17.6
Just about right	21	41.2
Good value for cost	9	17.6
Very good value for cost	11	21.6
Missing	1	2
Total	51	100

As might be expected, these three measures were all correlated with each other (see Table 10). However, and perhaps more important, they all correlate significantly with plans to attend future conventions. Those who are more satisfied with the present convention are more likely to plan to attend future conventions. Interestingly, future attendance is not related to opinions about the current convention in relation to past conventions.

*Table 10: Spearman correlations between measures of satisfaction and plans to attend future conventions*

		Overall rating	Value for cost	Been to previous how rate present?
Value for cost	<i>Correlation</i>	.55		
	<i>N</i>	50		
Been to previous how rate present?	<i>Correlation</i>	.34	.36	
	<i>N</i>	35	35	
Likely to attend future conventions?	<i>Correlation</i>	.33	.31	-.04
	<i>N</i>	50	50	35

*Submission Process*

In 2002, the submission procedure had included a requirement for a long (750-1000 word) summary as well as the usual 200-word abstract. We therefore probed opinions about the submission process.

Eight of the 51 respondents (15.7%) indicated that they had acted as reviewers for convention submissions. Twenty-five (49%) had submitted abstracts themselves, and all had had their papers accepted for presentation. This is not surprising; those whose papers were rejected might have decided not to attend.

When asked about their opinion of the submission requirements, the majority indicated that it was “about right” (28, or 55%), but ten (20%) felt that there was somewhat too much or too much information required (see Table 11).

*Table 11: Submission requirements*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Too much information	8	15.7
*	2	3.9
About right	28	54.9
*	1	2
Too little information	1	2
Missing	11	21.6
Total	51	100

For operational reasons the deadline for convention submissions is mid-October when the convention occurs in late May or early June. Respondents were asked their opinion of this deadline (Table 12). Although the majority felt it was “about right” there was a substantial minority who thought it was too early (in relation to the convention dates).

*Table 12: Submission deadline*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Too early	16	31.4
*	1	2
About right	25	49
*	1	2
Too late	1	2
Missing	7	13.7
Total	51	

2002 marked the first year of on-line submissions using a Web interface. The software was in place only at the end of September, so many submissions used the old, paper forms. Opinions of this service suggested that it was easy to use, but not all respondents had known of it or used it (Table 13). However, given that only 25 respondents submitted abstracts, and 19 did not answer this question it seems likely that some of the “unaware” individuals had not submitted abstracts. (Subsequently the Convention Committee decided that in future years on-line would be the primary submission method, and changes to promotional materials and procedures were implemented for 2003 and future years.)

*Table 13: On-line submission procedure*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Very difficult to use		0
Somewhat difficult to use		0
Neither easy nor difficult	3	5.9
Somewhat easy to use	8	15.7
Very easy to use	11	21.6
Unaware of on-line submissions	10	19.6
Missing	19	37.3
Total	51	100

Acceptance letters are usually mailed to authors in early February (about 3.5 months after submission). When asked about the length of the review process, most respondents indicated that it is “about right” (Table 14). Missing data for this question reflect the half of the sample that did not submit a presentation.

*Table 14: Length of review process*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Too long	1	2
*	1	2
About right	22	43.1
*	2	3.9
Too short	0	0
Missing	25	49
Total	51	100

Furthermore, most respondents felt that the standards of review are “about right”, although 12% felt they are too easy (Table 15).

*Table 15: Standards of review*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Too hard		0
*		0
About right	30	58.8
*	1	2
Too easy	5	9.8
Missing	15	29.4
Total	51	100

#### *Convention Activities*

The estimates of time spent by activity show that most respondents participated in a variety of convention activities (Table 16). Symposia and poster sessions occupied the most time, which one would expect given that most of the programme is given over to these activities. Conversation sessions and association meetings showed very skewed distributions, with most respondents not spending any time on these activities but a few spending a large percentage on them.

*Table 16: Percentage of time by activity*

	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Invited addresses	50	0	10	14.2	14.4
Workshops	60	0	2.5	11.8	16.33
Symposia	80	0	25	27.0	19.6
Conversation Sessions	75	0	0	9.7	16.3
Poster Sessions	80	0	15	17.3	15.0
Networked/met with friends	50	0	10	13.2	5.8
Association Meetings	40	0	0	12.7	10.8

Twenty-four respondents (47%) had attended either a CPA or a section social event. Fifteen (29%) had attended a CPA or a section business meeting.

#### *Programme Quality*

Respondents' rating of the quality of the various presentations can be seen in Table 17. In keeping with the activity data, symposia and poster sessions had data from the highest number of respondents who had attended this type of session. Ratings for invited addresses were the highest of all presentation types. Symposia and poster sessions were generally rated highly, but ratings for posters were slightly lower than for symposia.

*Table 17: Ratings of the quality of presentations*

	Very poor (%)	Poor (%)	Okay (%)	Good (%)	Very Good (%)	N	Did not attend (#)	Missing (#)
Invited talks		3.4	6.9	20.7	69	29	1	17
Symposia		2.4	31.7	34.1	31.7	41	1	9
Posters		7.7	28.2	38.5	25.6	39	2	10
Workshops			4.5	45.5	50	22	11	18
Conversation Sessions			14.3	42.9	42.9	21	11	19
Pre-convention workshops	9.1	18.2		36.4	36.4	11	21	19

The programming committee endeavoured to minimize scheduling two presentations at the same time that would appeal to the same person. In 2002 this was nonetheless a problem for many respondents. (See Table 18).

*Table 18: Frequency of schedule overlaps*

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	13	25.5
Occasionally	25	49
Rarely	8	15.7
Never	2	3.9
Missing	3	5.9
Total	51	

*Abstract book.* As can be seen in Table 19, reactions to the quality of the abstract index were generally positive.

*Table 19: Index quality of the abstract book*

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Awful		
Bad	1	2.0
Okay	10	19.6
Good	24	47.1
Excellent	13	25.5
Missing	3	5.9
Total	51	

### *Accommodation*

The majority of respondents stayed in the Gage Residence at UBC, closely followed by a large group who stayed in a hotel (Table 20). Most people reported paying between \$50-\$100 for accommodation, which is the range for most of the rooms at the Gage Residence (Table 21). No one rated the quality of their accommodation negatively (Table 22). Whatever price they paid, they felt that it was “about right” compared to the quality of the accommodation (Table 23). Most people indicated that they would like in future to stay in accommodations that were the same as their current accommodation (Table 24).

*Table 20: Accommodation choices*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Gage Residence	19	37.3
Hotel	16	31.4
Bed & Breakfast	1	2
Youth hostel	1	2
With Family or Friends	5	9.8
Home	4	7.8
Missing	5	9.8
Total	51	

*Table 21: Cost of accommodations*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Gage N</i>	<i>Gage %</i>
Nothing	7	13.7	2	10.5
\$50 or less	7	13.7	5	26.3
\$51-\$100	18	35.3	10	52.6
\$101-\$150	7	13.7	2	10.5
\$151-\$200	5	9.8		
> \$200				
Missing	7			
Total	51		19	

*Table 22: Quality of your accommodations?*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Gage N</i>	<i>Gage %</i>
Awful				
Bad	1	2		
Okay	14	27.5	8	42.1
Good	14	27.5	8	42.1
Excellent	11	21.6	3	15.8
Missing	11	21.6		
Total	51		19	

*Table 23: Accommodation cost relative to quality?*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Gage N</i>	<i>Gage %</i>
Too low				
A bit low	3	5.9	2	10.5
About right	26	51.0	14	73.7
A bit high	6	11.8	1	5.3
Too high	3	5.9	2	10.5
Missing	13	5.9		
Total	51		19	

*Table 24: Future accommodation costs*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Less expensive	2	3.9
The same as current	31	60.8
More expensive	7	13.7
Missing	11	21.6
Total	51	

*Convention Venue*

The general issue of whether to hold the convention on a campus, in a hotel or in a convention centre has been a matter of debate for some years. This was the second consecutive year in which the convention was held on a university campus. The majority rated the venue as “okay”, but a total of 37% rated it as “good” or “excellent”. Given the controversy over the choice of a campus venue, it is notable that very few negative ratings were provided.

*Table 25: Overall convention venue*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Awful		
Bad	4	7.8
Okay	25	49
Good	11	21.6
Excellent	8	15.7
Missing	3	5.9
Total	51	

There were two open-ended questions concerning the venue: “What is the best feature of this physical location for the convention?” and “What is the worst feature?” Two themes dominated the short responses to the first question: Seventeen respondents (33.3% of the entire sample, or 42.5% of respondents to this question) said that having all the parts of the convention close together, including accommodation, was the best feature. The second most frequent comment was specific to UBC: the natural beauty of the setting, its gardens, ocean, and scenery.

Although the specific comments for “worst features” varied, the most common theme was the distance of UBC from downtown activities (13 respondents, or 25.5% of the sample and 35% of the respondents to this question) The second most often mentioned feature was the perceived shabbiness of the Student Union Building (10 respondents, or 19.6% of the sample and 27% of respondents to this question).

We also asked directly which type of venue would be the better choice for future CPA conventions. The results show a tendency to prefer hotels or convention centres, but a sizeable group believes that university campuses are more suitable for CPA conventions (Table 26)

*Table 26: Better venue choice for future conventions*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Hotel	16	31.4
Convention Centre	8	15.7
University Campus	14	27.5
No preference	9	17.6
Missing	4	7.8
Total	51	

*Food Facilities*

Most people thought that the quality of the food facilities at the convention were “okay” (Table 27). In terms of cost for quality, the food was rated “about right” by most respondents (Table 28).

*Table 27: Quality of food facilities*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Awful	1	2
Bad	7	13.7
Okay	23	45.1
Good	10	19.6
Excellent	5	9.8
Missing	5	9.8
Total	51	

*Table 28: Cost of food relative to quality*

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Too low	1	2
*		
About right	38	74.5
*	2	3.9
Too high	5	9.8
Missing	5	9.8
Total	51	

*Sub-group Opinions*

*Students.* Most of the student respondents who answered the questions in this section reported having received financial support (8 of 14, or 57%) and felt comfortable while there (see Table 29).

*Table 29: [Students only] Overall, how did you feel while at the convention?*

	<i>Frequency</i>
Very uncomfortable	
Uncomfortable	
Okay	6
Comfortable	6
Very comfortable	3

*Clinicians.* Of the 24 respondents who answered the question, 19 (79%) said that they would appreciate regular clinical updates in their area. Sixty-nine percent said that they would benefit if they could receive Continuing Education credits for attending workshops and/or the convention.

### Discussion

The quality of these data are mixed; the sample size is small because there were too few data collectors operating for too little time. The sample is not representative in terms of the proportion of students, but is geographically representative of convention attendees. Nonetheless, the sample is a random sample, which is an improvement over interpreting data from those attendees who self-identified as having sufficient interest to respond. Clearly the most important effort for future evaluations is to ensure a larger and more representative sample.

### *Opinions of the 2002 CPA Convention*

Overall, respondents expressed themselves as being satisfied with the convention, with 65% rating it as “good” or “excellent”. Moreover, those who had attended previous conventions generally rated it as “the same” or “better” in quality (total of 74%). The quality of most session types was highly rated. The convention’s value in relation to its cost was “good value” or “very good value” by 39% of respondents, with a further 41 percent rating it as “just about right”. This suggests that the current system delivers a good convention experience at the right price for those who attend.

One of the most pressing questions for the Convention Committee concerns whether to hold the event on a university campus or in a hotel/convention centre. Data on this point show that the UBC venue was acceptable or better; although shabby in appearance, people appreciated the convenience of having events clustered close together. However, they did not like being far from downtown attractions. When asked directly what type of venue is most appropriate for a CPA convention, the majority responded “hotel” or “convention centre” (47% in total for these two options), with a minority in favour of university campuses (28%). Taken together with the 2001 evaluation, there is a pattern emerging in which university venues might be acceptable if they offer the convenience of one location together with adequate accommodations; but if the convention itself is not close to the accommodations (as in 2001), dissatisfaction results. In short, some universities might be suitable convention venues, and others will not.

### *Recommendations for Future Evaluations*

- This activity should occur annually, to provide ongoing tracking of Convention effectiveness.
- The questionnaire should be reduced in length. There was a large amount of missing data, and surveyors reported complaints about its length.
- Consider identifying a core set of questions to be repeated annually. Other topics could be visited on a cyclical basis (every 3 years, for example, one might ask about the submission process).
- Revisions of questions should be sensitive to the need to maintain comparability.
- On-site surveys miss obtaining data from those who do not attend. The committee should conduct a survey of CPA members, annually if possible, to include both attendees and non-attendees.

- More surveyors are required! One problem was the requirement for a half-day of service, which is a half-day lost from convention attendance. Consider shorter shifts for more people.
- This is a useful exercise, but one that requires the same care and attention as any research project. The subcommittee for this evaluation included two Board members with other duties at the convention. The success of future evaluations will depend on its being conducted by people who are not simultaneously serving CPA in other capacities.

### *Conclusions*

The CPA Convention appears to be serving its attendees well in its present configuration, although there is room for improvement. Whether it serves all CPA members well is a matter for a separate investigation that includes those not present at the convention in any given year. Nonetheless, the data presented here provide guidance to the Convention Committee and the Board in making decisions about future conventions.

### Reference

Ross, A., Gallivan, J., Schepmyer, H., & Veitch, J. (2001). *Evaluation of the 2001 Canadian Psychological Association convention*. Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Psychological Association, Ottawa. Retrieved April 9, 2003 from [http://www.cpa.ca/convention\\_evaluation\\_2001.pdf](http://www.cpa.ca/convention_evaluation_2001.pdf)

### Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Bryan Randall for his work on the data entry, and to Kathy Lachapelle-Petrin, Marlene Kealey and CPA Head Office staff for assistance with all aspects of the evaluation.

Appendix A  
 2002 Evaluation Questionnaire  
**Evaluation of the Canadian Psychological Association Convention**  
 University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC  
 May 30 - June 1, 2002

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ R V

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1. In which province/state do you work?

2. To which psychological organization(s) do you belong?

3. Do you belong to any CPA Section(s)? Yes No  
 If "Yes" please list the section(s) to which you belong.

4. We are interested in your primary identity as a psychologist. Would you categorize yourself primarily as a (**check one only**):

	<b>Publicly funded organization (e.g., hospitals, universities, government)</b>	<b>Private Sector</b>
<b>Practitioner</b>		
<b>Practitioner-Scientist</b>		
<b>Scientist</b>		
<b>Educator</b>		
<b>Student</b>		
<b>Other</b>		

5. Are you registered for:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ The whole convention      \_\_\_\_\_ One day      Which days? \_\_\_\_\_





20. How would you rate the quality of the presentations you attended?  
 (Please use checkmarks in the appropriate boxes)

	<b>Very poor</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Okay</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>Didn't attend</b>
<b>Symposia/paper sessions</b>						
<b>Posters</b>						
<b>Conversation sessions</b>						
<b>Invited talks</b>						
<b>Workshops</b>						
<b>Pre-convention workshops</b>						

21. Were there times when two sessions you wanted to attend were given at the same time?

Never                  Rarely                  Occasionally                  Frequently

22. Are there any other presentation types you would like to see?  
 (e.g., case conference; film....)

**Abstract Book**

23. How would you rate the index quality of the abstract book/programme, (e.g., did you have problems finding when or where events were occurring)?

Awful                  Bad                  Okay                  Good                  Excellent

24. Did you attend any CPA or section social events?                  Yes                  No  
 If you did not, was there any particular reason why not?

25. Did you attend any CPA or section business meetings?                  Yes                  No  
 If you did not, was there any particular reason why not?

**Location**

***Accommodations***

26. Where did you stay while at the convention?

27. How much did your accommodations cost per night? (Please indicate an amount, even if you did not pay it yourself.)

Nothing      \$50 or less      \$51-\$100      \$101-\$150      \$151-\$200      > \$200

28. How would you rate the quality of your accommodations while at the convention?

Awful      Bad      Okay      Good      Excellent

29. How would you rate the cost of your accommodations compared to the quality?

too low      a bit low      about right      a bit high      too high

30. If you come to a future convention, would you try to stay at accommodations which were

Less expensive      Same as current one      More expensive

***Venue*** (UBC Student Union Building)

31. What is the best feature of this physical location for the convention?

32. What is the worst feature?

33. How would you rate the overall quality of the convention venue (e.g., layout, places to meet colleagues, seating, temperature)?

Awful      Bad      Okay      Good      Excellent

***Food***

34. How would you rate the quality of food facilities while at the convention?

Awful      Bad      Okay      Good      Excellent

